

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 14, 2007, has been carefully considered. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Applicants appreciated the Examiner's indication that claim 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the following remarks, and pass the application to allowance.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to allegedly show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicant submits herewith a new drawing sheet (sheet 3 / Figure 4) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). Accordingly, withdrawal of said rejection is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 5-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5, 16 and 17 have been amended to overcome the rejections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Vandromme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,627).

Claim 1 recites a device for packaging and dispensing several fluid products, comprising at least two extraction pumps with parallel axes and at least two containers containing the products to be dispensed, wherein the first pump is mounted so that it can move axially in the chamber of the second pump, such that the movement of the first pump operates the second pump.

Vandromme et al. relates to pump-type distribution devices and, in particular, to such devices for distributing a product that is relatively viscous, e.g., cream, gel or milk. The pump-type spraying device includes two chambers, wherein the first chamber contains the viscous product and the second one contains the distribution

fluid. However, according to Vandromme et al., the two pistons are on the same rod and move simultaneously and in parallel. Although, the movement of the first pump operates the second pump, the first pump does not move axially in the chamber of the second pump. Accordingly, since Vandromme et al. does not teach a device for packaging and dispensing several fluid products, wherein the first pump is mounted so that it can move axially in the chamber of the second pump as recited in claim 1, claim 1 should be allowable. Claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 are dependent from claim 1, and for the reasons set forth above as to claim 1, claims 2, 4, 5, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 should also be allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Vandromme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,627) in view of Obrist (U.S. Patent No. 4,673,107).

Claims 6-8 recite the device of claim 5, which comprises at least two bags combined with a single ring for fastening to the container and to the pumps; which comprises two bags made from different materials; and which comprises two bags, one inside the other, the neck of the larger bag surrounding that of the smaller one, a space being left between the two necks for filling and expelling the product, respectively.

Obrist relates to a two-compartment package comprising an outer container and an inner container arranged within the outer container. For the reasons set forth above as to claim 1, and further since Obrist does not teach a device wherein the first pump is mounted so that it can move axially in the chamber of the second pump, claims 6-8 should be allowable.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Vandromme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,627) in view of Connan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,954,234).

Claim 9 recites the device as claimed in claim 5, which comprises two bags formed as a single piece, in the form of a double bag comprising two compartments separated by a partition.

Connan relates to a tubular container comprising at least two chambers. However, since Connan does not provide any teaching whatsoever regarding the pumps, and further for the reasons set forth above as to claim 1, claim 9 should be allowable.

Conclusion

For the reasons presented above, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 14, 2007

By: /KMNuzum/
Kirk M. Nuzum
Registration No. 38983

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(650) 622-2300